



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES.

Baltimore, June, 1896.

## NOTES ON HALL'S CONCISE ANGLO-SAXON DICTIONARY. I.

WHEN Mr. Hall set to work on his Anglo-Saxon Dictionary, it was with the avowed purpose of enabling the student to have 'something better to begin with than the Ettmüller or Bosworth of forty or fifty years ago.' And, in fact, with the wealth of sources to draw upon, he might have given us a work that could safely be placed into the hands of the beginner and that would prove to be a real assistance to him in the study of Old English. However, Mr. Hall's principal aim seems to have been to swell the bulk of his book, so that he might be able to say that 'the number of words given which are not to be found in the parts of Bosworth-Toller already issued is upwards of two thousand.' With that goal in view, he has not troubled himself with carefully examining his sources: Leo's dictionary, Bosworth's, Wülker's reëdition of Wright's glossaries, Sweet's *Oldest English Texts*, etc., are simply so many books that furnish him material for compilation; wherever he finds any thing looking like a word that might be entered in his book, he forthwith puts it down. No wonder, then, that a good many 'repeaters' have made their appearance and swelled the volume of the legitimate vote. For example, Leo in his dictionary, exhibits a compound *sygdiryfter*, which is the *sigdiriftr* on record in the Epinal-Erfurt glossaries as Old English for *falcis* (*Corpus Gloss. Lat.* v, 361, 3)=*siðe riftras* in the *Corpus Glossary* (WW. 21, 17). This *sigdi riftr* Sweet in his OET. gives correctly as two words and accordingly we find in Hall's book for the two words three entries, namely,

*sigdi*=*siðe*.

*riftr* sm. reaping-hook, sickle, scythe; and *sygdiryfter* sm. plane? (Leo).

In the MSS. the forms for *f* and *w* are often so nearly alike that they have given rise to many misunderstandings and errors in transcribing. Owing to such a mistake Leo has a form *beaf* (for *beaw*) and so we find by the side of the correct '*beaw* sm. gadfly,' the

wrong '*beaf* gadfly (Leo)' in Hall's book. Just as *f* and *w*, so appear *þ* and *r* occasionally mixed up, owing to the similarity of their form in the MSS.; so we have WW. 240, 16 flebilis *werendlic* mistakenly for *wependlic*, but Hall, indiscriminately, has taken up both forms; I do not know to whom he is indebted for the correct entry '*wependlic* deplorable, mournful,' but from Wright-Wülker 240, 16, he got:

'*werendlic* lamentable, doleful.'

In the *Corpus Glossary* (ed. Hessels, C 443) there is a *clibecti* explaining *clibosum*; Sweet, owing to some strange mistake thought this meant 'cleaving' and thus it appears in Hall's book. This same *clibosum* occurs again WW. 364, 19 glossed *clifhte*, then in the form *cliuosum* i. *inclinatum*, WW. 205, 33, glossed *clifæhtig* and finally as '*cliuosus clifig, tohyld* WW. 111, 36, and so we find then by the side of the wrong '*clifæht*, cleaving' the two correct entries of the same word:

'*clifæhtig*, steep, and *clifig, clifht*, steep.'

There is no documentary evidence justifying such an entry as *eorðcrypel*, 'earth-creeper,' paralytic, palsied man; it is simply an invention of Mr. Sweet who in this way tried to get at the meaning of the gloss *applare eorscripel* which he found in the *Corp. Gl.* (ed. Hessels, A 706=WW. 6, 23.) Very likely *applare* is blunder for *auriculare* or *auriscalpū* (*auris scalprum*, cf. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* ii, 482, 57). At any rate, the *eorscripel* of the *Corp. Glossary* is surely identical with the *earscripel* of WW. 291, 27 glossing *auricularis*, which Hall has entered as *ear-scripel-scripel* 'earpicker, little finger.' By the side of that we find also the entry *eorscripel*=*earscripel*, that is to say, the very same word which already had been entered in the wrong form *eorðcripel* was entered again, only now in its right form, *eorscripel*. It is just so with the words: *ecilma*, *æcelma*, *æcilma*. Under *ecilma* you are referred to *æcelma* which is explained as meaning 'chilblain,' for *æcilma* we must be satisfied with the Latin *palagra* that appears WW. 227, 8. (Of *ecilmehti*, glossing *palagdrigus* WW. 38, 7, he does not make any mention at all.) Now, if Mr. Hall had

carefully examined his sources, he would not have been taken in by Mr. Sweet's '*æcelma*, chilblain,'<sup>1</sup> for then he could not have failed to see that the *palagra* glossed *ecilma*, WW. 37, 24 (to which gloss Sweet's '*æcelma*, chilblain,' refers) is identical with the *palagra* glossed *ecilma*, WW. 277, 8, and also with the *palagra* glossed *æcelma*, WW. 468, 14. As to the word *palagra*, it looks like a conflation of a Latin and Greek word, perhaps it is=*paleæ acyra* (=ἄχυρα), cf. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* iii, 299, 64, ἄχυρα, *paleæ*; *ibid.* 508, 22 *axyra*, *palea*; 508, 23 *axras*, *palea*; 193, 49 *achura*, *palea*. The Old English *æcelma* (*æcilma*, *ecilma*) would then be a derivative of *ecil* (*ecil*)<sup>2</sup>=*egl* by means of the suffix *-ma3* (cf. Northumbrian *wæst*: common Anglo-Saxon *wæstma* *wæstm*, MHG. *bluost*: Anglo-Saxon *blōstma*). We can then also dispose of WW. 38, 7 *palagdrigus ecilmehhti* which would be *paleariumg. acyreom* (=ἄχυρεῶν, cf. *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* iii, 299, 77) *ecilmehci*=*ecilmecci*, cf. OHG. *gaui-sa-hi quisquilæ*. The meaning of the word would then be 'heap of ails (eils),' 'bran-bin.' Cockayne thinks that *palagra* is corrupted, from *podagra*, which is certainly possible, but hardly probable in this instance, since the Anglo-Saxon interpretation is not in favor of it. For, it must be borne in mind, these Anglo-Saxon explanations are (as a rule) but substitutes of former Latin interpretations and they generally keep close to the meaning of the Latin words they represent. Now if *podagra*

<sup>1</sup> Sweet has it from Cockayne. *Leechd.* ii, 367.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Epinal Glossary*, ed. Sweet, p. 21, E 12 *quisquillæ æhrian* (= *Corp. Gl. Lat.* v, 385, 48); *Erfurt Gl.* (= *Corp. Gl. Lat.* v, 385, 48) *quisquillæ ægrihan*.

<sup>3</sup> This suffix gives the word a tinge of generality, as seen from the *Erfurt Gloss. tyndir-m* (*Corp. Gloss. Lat.* v, 367, 27)=everything pertaining to 'tinder.' Just so we have *wyrsm* (by metathesis *wyrms*, WW. 210, 42 *colera uentris inflatio uel solutio wyrms* and from that *wyrmsig*, WW. 494, 7 *purulentis ðæm wyrmsigum*) by the side of *wyrs* in WW. 113, 8 *phthisis wyrs-hwæcing uel wyrs us* (=ur) *spung*. Hence I think that the interpretation *deagwyrmede* appearing WW. 161, 31 for *podagricus* ought to be *ðeohgewyrmede*, 'suffering with thigh-(hip-) disease,' and *dæggede* stands very likely for *ðeohcedde* 'suffering with thigh-(hip-)ache.' Hall has taken up both words without a challenge. In Gregory's *Past. Care* i, 273, 22 (EETS., ed. Sweet) we meet with a *wors-m putrado* (*Epinal Gloss.*, ed. Sweet, p. 19, C. 7) *pus wors-m*.

<sup>4</sup> These may have been steps of corruption: *paleariū8. agyreor, paleurgarigeor, palagorigur, palagdrigus*.

had been the lemma, the interpretation would very likely have been *dolor pedum* and that no such thing can be represented by *æcelma*, is clear, whether we take it to mean as Cockayne does 'annoying chill' or as I should say, 'furfuration.' The way Cockayne has arrived at the meaning 'chilblain' is this: Mone<sup>1a</sup> exhibits a gloss *mulas acelman*. *Mula*, however, according to *Gl. Harl.* 3388, *est quædam infirmitas in homine quæ vocatur gybehos*, that is, says Cockayne, 'kibe of heel,' which is confirmed by Florio's *mule Kibes chilblanes* and Cotgrave's *mule a Kibe*. But Mone's *mules*, I have reason to believe, is rather mutilation of *glumulas* and *glumula* we find glossed WW. 412, 3 by *gewrid egenu oððe scealu*, which fits in with the explanation we have offered and also *Leechd.* ii, 70 *pis sceal wip æcelman and wip þon þe men acalep fel of þam fotum* can well be explained along those lines: 'This is to be used against furfuration and in case one gets the skin of the feet furfureous, that is, the skin peels off.' And that our explanation of *æcelma* would hold good, even if *palagra* is all right as it seems, is to be inferred from *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* iii, 604, 23, *palagra pustulu rupta in cute*. Likely enough, is this *palagra* identical with modern Italian *pellagra*; 'malattia molto frequente dei nostri paesi subalpini . . . Malattia della pella dell'ordine delle impetigini, laquale particolarmente attacca il dorso delle mani e de' piedi con senso molesto di stramento, di prurito e di ardore, a cui succede lo screpolamento della cuticola, per cui cadendo questa sotto la forma di squamma furfuracee rimane la dermide denudata, presentando dalle macchie irregolari rossice e lucenti, as the *Dizionario* of Tommaseo-Bellini has it. Of course, if *palagra* is one word, then *palagdrigus* may be a mistake for the adjective derived from it, *palagricus* and *ecilmehhti* is then *ecilm-ehti(g)* 'full of furfuration, inclined to be furfureous.'

From *egl* (*egle*), the Old English representative of modern *ail* (mote, beard on wheat), Hall, in the way characteristic of him, has succeeded in getting three entries; namely (1) '*egl*, sf., mote, beard on wheat,' (2) '*egle*, sf., dormouse,' (3) '*elgum*' dp. of sb. '*aristis*,' WW. 532,

<sup>1a</sup> *Quellen und Forschungen*, etc., p. 359, 11.

27. From Bosworth (probably) he took the right rendering 'beard on wheat,' from Sweet's *Oldest English Texts* the wrong one 'dormouse,' and from Wright-Wülker the Latin '*aristis*' which he did not care or dare to translate. Sweet, of course, was misled by the fact that in our Latin dictionaries there is only a '*glis*, *gliris* = dormouse' on record. But the Latin Glossaries know also of a *glis*, *glitis* (=glus, glutis?) and that the Anglo-Saxon glossators had reference only to that word Hall might easily have established, if he had taken the trouble to compare the passages quoted by Sweet, OET., p. 524b, under *egel*, *egla*, *eglan*, *eglum*, *elgum*.

Then he would surely not have committed that ridiculous blunder either of making out of the corrupted Latin *foufyr* (= *furfur*, 'bran'), occurring WW. 413, 12, an Anglo-Saxon '*foufyr* sb. dormouse.'<sup>6</sup> In what careless, nay frivolously reckless way, Hall has gathered his words may be seen from the following two entries: (1) '*æmbern* sb. *bothonia*, *bædro-mia*?' WW. 195, 20 [*ymbryne*?], and (2) '*embren* sn. bucket, pail' ES. viii, 154 [Germ. *Eimer*]. Both entries refer to the same gloss, namely, WW. 195, 20, the only difference between the two numbers being, that (1) repeats Wülker's bad conjecture, while (2) gives the correct explanation as pointed out by Sievers (ES. viii, 154) when criticizing Wülker's guess at the meaning of the word. The only inference to be drawn from such a proceeding as that is that Hall was fully aware of the precariousness of his first entry, but did not care to miss an opportunity of adding to his stock of words when he could do so on the apparent authority of an Anglo-Saxon scholar like Wülker. This inference is borne out by further facts I shall submit. By the side of the right entry: *fæsten*, sn., 'fastness fortified place, castle, etc.,' we find the nonsensical: *wefæsten*, sn., 'citadel,' on the strength of WW. 515, 39: *quasi arx swa wefæsten*, al-

<sup>5</sup> Cf. WW. 118, 37 Loewe, *Coniect. ad Gloss. Lat.*, p. 120.

<sup>6</sup> Very likely also a third Anglo-Saxon word quoted by Hall from WW. 119, 5=320, 29 as equivalent for 'dormouse,' namely, *sisemus* represents by its first part the translation for *glis*, *glitis*, *sise* being mistake for *sifepe* (cf. WW. 549, 1. 2), and by its second part, *mus*, the translation for *glis*, *gliris*.

though Sievers had drawn his attention to the fact that this is a blunder for *swaswe fæsten*. Side by side with the only authentic entry: *helpendrap*, sm., 'opifera' (WW. 463, 35), meaning 'steadying line,'<sup>7</sup> we meet with an entry *helpend-bær*, a word for which there is no documentary evidence, but which is only a bad conjecture of Wülker for *helpendrap* which he did not understand, as pointed out by Sievers. By the side of: *æswica*, wm., 'offender, deceiver, hypocrite, traitor, deserter,' which is based on WW. 219, 35 and pronounced all right by Sievers, there is entered an: *æscwiga*, 'spear-warrior,' drawn from Wülker's ill-advised attempt at altering the proper word *æswica*.

Just so the very same gloss (WW. 41, 8) *probus ferht* furnishes him on the one hand an adjective *fehrt* 'honest,' and on the other hand a noun *fehrt*<sup>8</sup> = *fyrhtu*, that is to say, for the first entry he relied on Sweet's OET., who explained the word correctly enough; for the second, however, although warned by Sievers, he drew on Wülker's conjecture, saying that *probus* is mistake for *phobus* = *φόβος*. This smuggling in of such a questionable word as *ferht* for *fyrhtu* is the more reprehensible as Hall does not cite his authority for it, just as he failed to do in a good many other cases. *Ferht* is of course an adjective derived by means of the suffix *-eht* (= 'having') from the noun *ferh* (= 'life'), and is certainly a good rendering for *probus*. Hall could not have failed to gather from Sievers' remarks on WW. 32, 28, how silly it was of Wülker to repeat Bosworth's ridiculous guess at the meaning of *hearma*, but, intent as he was on increasing his stock of words, he was well satisfied with being supplied by Sweet with a *hearma* meaning 'shrew-mouse, ermine,' and by Wülker with a *hearma* meaning 'a sling for supporting a wounded arm'; *hearma* of course is related to German *Hermel*, and is a sort of weasel or stoat, as is evident from WW. 34, 7: *netila* (= *nitela*) *hearma*.

This desire to swell at any cost his word-list really seems to have blinded Hall's judgment. Or is there any other construction to be

<sup>7</sup> Cf. WW. 182, 29 and 288, 27.

<sup>8</sup> However, it is just possible that he refers to WW. 77, 5, *pauor ferht*, although he does not cite any authority.

put upon his entering by the side of the right forms such evident blunders as: *nepe*, 'fierce' for *repe*, or *wægel*, 'gill, quarter of a pint, small vessel,' for *pægel*, especially when we consider that he did so after having read Sievers' remarks on the respective passages, WW. 479, 33 and 124, 2? Why did he enter: *wæterrap*, 'cable' from WW. 535, 4, when from his previous entry: *wæderap*, 'cable,' taken from WW. 515, 15 and referring to the same Latin word *rudens*, he could not but have learned that *wæderap* is the only correct form (cf. WW. 5, 44: *antenne wæde*? What does he mean by entering from *Haupt's Zeitschrift* the unexplained and corrupt form *duphaman* 'malleoli,' when a comparison with the later entry *dyp-homar-homer* must have told him that *duphaman* is simply misreading or blunder for *duphamar*, and then a glance in his Latin dictionary and at WW. 492, 40 *malleoli tyndercyn idest dyphomer* would have suggested 'saplings (such as are cut for) kindling wood,' as proper rendering for *duphamar*, *dyphomar*, *dyphomer*.<sup>9</sup>

Hall thoroughly understands the art of getting much out of little; so the one gloss *deuia callus (h)orweg stig* (WW. 17, 16; 384, 40; 220, 36) has given him occasion for three entries: (1) *horweg*, aj., 'muddy'; (2) *horuweg*, sm., 'dirty road'; (3) *orwegstig*, sf., 'out-of-the-way-track.' (1) to be sure, is to be put on Sweet's account (cf. OET., p. 576a); but if Hall had looked into the matter, he would have found out from 220, 36 that *devia* is *orweg*, that is, 'trackless' and *callus* (= *callis*), *stig*, that is, 'path, road.' As in this instance the wrongly aspirated form of the word has played him a trick, so in several others. WW. 385, 3 we read *descurreis hofðelum*; as he could not make anything of it, but still wished to use it as material for his book, he bodily transferred it there. To understand the gloss, we have simply to properly divide it: *de scurreis*, and then it becomes plain that *hof* must stand for *of*, and *ðelum* is = *ðylum*; cf. 458, 15 *oratores ðylæs*, whence he got his entry: *ðyle*, sm.,

<sup>9</sup> But is *dup-*, *dyp-*, the right form of the first part of the word? When I compare such compounds as *ðyfe-porn* WW. 149, 39, *risc-þysel* 289, 3 and the diminutive *þysel* 137, 26; 139, 19.24; 244, 20.22; 324, 38 and the verb 408, 2 *frutescit þusfaþ*, 492, 29 *luxoriantæ faeste geþusf*, I cannot help thinking that we ought to read *ðusfhammar*, *ðysfhamar*, *ðysfhamer* 'a sapling of luxuriant growth,' as is the *malleolus*.

'spokesman, speaker, orator,' and as he might have added from 385, 3, 'funmaker, humorist.' Also bodily transferred is the gloss *repagulum salpanra* WW. 106, 7, and yet Sievers had already pointed out that we have to read *sal punda*, that is, 'the pound-bar, inclosure-bar, fence-rail'; cf. 43, 26 *repagula sale*, referring to which gloss Sweet (OET., p. 587a) wrongly explains *sal* as 'bond'; it is rather 'a bar, pole, rail, stick'; in fact it is the contracted form of *sagol*, glossed *fustis* 332, 30, or *sagul*, glossed *paxillus* (for that is the true reading) 126, 18. It is also met with in the Anglo-Saxon (c. 1000) translation of the Gospels, Matt. 26, 47: *sahlum fustibus*, and Marc. 14, 43: *sahlum lignis*.

Intent as Hall was on new words, he has been repeatedly taken in by Wülker. So in WW. 460, 4 the latter did not see that the glossator explained *oreæ*, the archaic Latin word for 'bridle,' by the more modern one *frena*, nor did he know Latin enough to recognize in the *numine leso* 456, 27 the Latin *numine læso*. Consequently we have the two fine entries: *fræne* 'oreæ' and *leso*, sf., 'numen.' Likewise in 403, 21, Wülker failed to understand that *fiscalis ræde* is Latin = *fiscalis rhedæ*, which is explained *gafellicum wænfare* (as he ought to have known from 22, 17) and so Hall entered, however, without citing his authority: *rædegafol*, sn., 'rent paid in one payment (in money or kind)'; that is to say, from a mere blunder of Wülker he coined a new word to enrich his dictionary. Just so 357, 32, Wülker had not been aware of the fact that two glosses had been crowded on one line; namely, *bapys treuteru*, and *ban segn*, although 8, 30 *ban segn*, and 8, 31 *bapis treuteru*, ought to have led him to a proper understanding of the situation. From 357, 32, his great authority Bosworth-Lye had guessed that *treuteru* (= 'tree-tar') must signify 'a sort of standard,' and this he imparts to his readers in the note to 8, 31. Now, that Hall did not fall into the trap, he simply owes to Sweet's correctly explaining *treuteru*, but from 357, 32 he gets the entry *bansegn*, sm., 'interest on money, money lent on interest,' which is taken from 515, 1 *fenus hiereborg*. It is evident from 237, 37 that we have to divide *hiere borg*; as to *hiere*, it is likely it

stands for *hiera*; cf. 440, 11; 442, 4; 508, 1. WW. 130, 15 we meet with that monster of a word *geldhealhalgung*, explaining Latin 'ceremonia uel orgia.' Hall, not understanding it, bodily transferred it. But a look at 107, 22 ought to have resolved him the riddle into the three words *geld*, (*h*)*eal halgung*, that is, 'guild (cf. the broad meaning of Danish 'Gilde,') every sort of hallowing=feast, every sort of festal day' (cf. 519, 17, etc.).

It did not occur to Hall to glance at 471, 18: *per cola purh sticceo*, before he entered: *purh-sticcian*, vv., 'to strain through, filtrate, percolate,' from 487, 16; or to remember that there is such a word as: *tælg*, 'dye,' before he transferred from 513, 2 the blunder: '*geælged*, colored,' into his book; or that *tælg* and *deag* are two separate words meaning the same thing;<sup>10</sup> or to learn from 375, 10: '*cient hrepað*,' that his entry *hrewað*, taken from 533, 2, is a blunder for: '*hrepað*=they call.'

Very interesting is it to trace the way he came by the following entries:

(1) '*blæcðrust*, sm., tetter, scab, leprosy (*blæc*, *ðrust*);

(2) '*ðrut*, sb., eruption, leprosy';

(3) '*ðrustfel*, sn., eruption, leprosy.'

These three entries refer to one gloss 9, 6: *bitiligo blæcþrustfel*. Sweet<sup>11</sup> made of that: '*prust-fell*, sn., leprosy,' and that accounts for (3), Wülker divided it into an OE. *blæcþrust* and a Latin *fel*, and that accounts for (1); (2) is of Hall's own making, gotten up from a faint remembrance of the second component of (1). To arrive at a satisfactory understanding of the gloss in question, we must go a little deeper into the matter than Hall has done. In the *Epinal-Erfurt Glossaries*<sup>12</sup> the gloss is found in this form: *bitiligo blæcþrust fel*; in the *Corpus Glossary*,<sup>13</sup> B. 103, thus: *bitiligo blæcþrust, fel*; the concurrence of manuscript evidence is then decidedly in favor of separating *fel* from *blæcþrust*; the Latin word occurs again under the letter U in the *Ep. -Erf. Gl.*<sup>14</sup> as: *uitiligo (uitiligo) blecþa*, and in the *Corp.*

*Gl.*, U. 168: *uitiginem (=uitiliginem) bleci*; U. 180, *uitiligo blecþa*. What is meant by *uitiligo*, becomes clear from *Corp. Gloss. Lat.* iv, 193, 40: *uitiligo macula alba corpore alfon greci et proram (=psoram=ψωρα)* *uocant*;<sup>15</sup> *blecþa* is then an exact rendering of *uitiligo=ἄλφος*. We meet with this *uitiginem (=uitiliginem)* again in Steinmeyer-Sievers, *Althochd. Gloss.*, ii. 356, 5, where it is glossed *blēci*, and as the reference there is to Orosius, i, 8: '*Sed Ægyptii cum scabiem et vitiliginem paterentur . . . .*'; it is very likely that the above-quoted glosses owe their origin to the same author. Orosius speaks there of the plague God sent down on the Egyptians and their cattle at the instance of Moses.<sup>16</sup> Under these circumstances I think it probable that *blecþrust (blæcþrust)* is misreading or blunder for: *blec- (blæc) þrusc=* 'the white thrush, scourge (plague).' In *þrusc (ðrusc)* I see a verbal noun of: *prescan*, 'to scourge';<sup>17</sup> the Anglo-Saxon name for this leprosy would then exactly coincide with the Hebrew word for it, which means: 'the stroke,' 'the stroke of the scourge.'<sup>18</sup> As to *fel*,<sup>19</sup> that may be the remnant of another gloss: *bilis (uilis) fel*.<sup>20</sup> Let us now look at the entries:

<sup>15</sup> *Corp. Gl. Lat.* ii, 210, 2: *vitiligo ἄλφος ἀλωπη-κεα*. A.-S. *bleci*=OHG. *pleichi*.

<sup>16</sup> Cf. *Exod.*, 9, 9.

<sup>17</sup> Cf. *þearsca caedere, concidere*, Lindisfarne Gospels, *Marc.*, 5, 5; 12, 5; *Luc.*, 22, 63.

<sup>18</sup> Cf. *The Imperial Bible Dictionary*, s. v. leprosy.

<sup>19</sup> I am well aware of the attempt that has been made to establish an OE. *prust-fell* on the basis of Goth. *þ uts-fill* but manuscript evidence seems to be against it.

<sup>20</sup> Cf. WW. 9, 7=*Corp. Gl.*, B. 108: *bile atr*, B. 172: *bilem amarum*; U. 195; *uilis pestis*. On the strength of such a gloss as that one might conjecture that *fel* is misreading for *waæl=pestis*. King Ælfred uses this word when referring to the *scabiem et uitiliginem* of Orosius: *For þaem wole þe on þæt land becom, se scop waes secgende þæt Ægypti adriſen Moyses ut mid his leodum*. Orosius has: *Sed Ægypti cum scabiem et vitiliginem paterentur, cum cum aegris, ne pestis ad plures serperet, terminis Ægypti pellunt*. The form *waæl* occurs in Bede, 289 (s. Sweet OET., 473a): *et cladis on waæle*. Concerning the confusion of *f* and *w*, cf. WW. 480, 1: *inþetu waære=faere*; 254, 36: *præcipitata besceowene=besceofene*; 523, 38: *uoluentibus fealdendun=wealtendum*; 495, 20: *occa wealh=fealh*; 121, 17: *scarabeus scearnþfel=scearnwifel*; 458, 7: *occa furh, fylging, wath=f. f. falh*.

<sup>10</sup> WW. 512, 30.

<sup>11</sup> OET., p. 520a.

<sup>12</sup> *Corp. Gl. Lat.* v, 347, 31.

<sup>13</sup> Ed. Hessels.

<sup>14</sup> *Corp. Gl. Lat.* v, 399, 14.

(1) 'halstān, sm., crystal (EG).'

(2) 'healstān, sm., small cake (WW. 364, 36; 372, 17; 495, 28).'

(3) 'helsta, wn?, crust (WW. 216, 5).'

(4) '-hylsten, aj., twisted (WW. 393, 31).'

It would not seem possible that every one of these words refers to exactly the same thing, and yet it is so, as Hall might have easily found out, if instead of mechanically copying from his different sources, he had examined the words before entering them. He would then have seen that Sweet's explanation 'crystal' for (1) was based on a misunderstanding of the form *crustulla*, on record in the *Erfurt Gl.*,<sup>21</sup> just as if it represented a Greek κρύσταλλα, but a look into the *Corp. Gl.* (=WW. 16, 10), where the identical gloss occurs in the form *crustula similis* (=similaginis) *haalstan*, ought to have convinced anybody knowing Latin that the reference is to a sort of cake. Very likely the gloss is taken from *Exod.* 29, 23, where the *Vulgate* reads: *tortamque panis unius, crustulam conspersam oleo, laganum de canistro azymorum.*<sup>21b</sup> Having settled that, it would not have been difficult to see that WW. 216, 5 *crustula helsta uel rinde* stands for *crustula helstā*=*helstan u. r.*, and that *helstan* is only a variation of what we read WW. 16, 10, *haalstaan*. With that same word he would then also have identified WW. 364, 36, *colliridam healstan*, and he would also have noticed that *hylstene* occurring 393, 31, *et tortam panis* and *hylstene hlafas*, must be related to the same word and must mean 'cake, bread.' However, while it is plain enough what is meant by *haalstaan*, the etymology of the word is not so clear. Apparently the first component represents the wellknown *hāl*= 'whole, sound,' and the second is *stān*= 'stone,' and the idea suggested by such a compound may have been one of the reasons why Sweet explained it as meaning 'crystal,' for, I dare say, he

<sup>21</sup> OET., *Erf.*, 288.

<sup>21b</sup> In Ælfric's rendering of this passage: *and anne holne half mid ele gespring ende and anne gebegedne half of para peorfra halfa windle*, there seems to be some confusion, *holne* is evidently=*hālne* and renders *tortam*=*tostam*, while *gebegedne* seems to render the same word as pp. *torquere*. The passage should then read: *and anne holne hlaf oððe anne gebegedne half mid ele gesprengende and . . . of para peorfra klafa windle.*

remembered that medicinal properties were ascribed to precious stones. But it seems to me, it would be hard to bridge over the gulf between the meaning 'whole-stone' and 'cake.' I think I am justified in identifying *haal*- with *aal*-, which we have in *aal-gewerc*, 'tinder' WW. 26, 5, *aal-fatu*, 'firepots,' 'cooking vessels' 212, 24, '*al-daht* (?)<sup>22</sup> earthen pot suitable to put on the fire for cooking.' WW. 5, 5. Then we have an easy transition of meaning, namely, *haal-staan* (1) *petra focaria* = 'hearth-stone,' (2) *panis focarius* 'the bread-cake baked on the hearth stone' = Italian *focaccia* = Spanish *hogaza* = French *fouasse* = OHG. *fochanza* = MHG. *fagatzte*, *fochenze*, = Mod. Bavarian<sup>23</sup> *fogetze*. Then *hylstene*<sup>23b</sup> = *hylstēne hlafas* is the same thing that elsewhere (WW. 153, 36) is called *heorð bacene hlafas*, and *tortam* is not participle of *torquere*, but of *torrere*, that is to say it stands for *tostam*. Concerning the form *haal* (for *aal*), I am inclined to think that there the original aspirate has been preserved, and I would connect the word with Latin *cal-or cal-ere*. That the number of forms lacking the true aspirate, is prevalent as against those exhibiting it in the same text, need not make us wonder, considering the uncertainty that very early appears in (OHG. as well as) Old-English documents in regard to what words were to be aspirated and what not. Here I should like to establish the fact that the 'ell' of old New-England houses is really a 'hell,' that is to say, a 'fire place' = Latin *colina* (*culina*), but that would carry me too far away from my present purpose; I must return to Hall's dictionary. I have already cited several instances of puzzling glosses being bodily transferred, just to fill the book. Here is another: *tetridit* 'desiccit' OET., p. 654. Now Sweet, OET., p. 516a, had really tried to make the

<sup>22</sup> For *al-ðahrt*, -ðahrt from *ðoh*=clay? cf. OHG. *dāha* = (1) clay, (2) earthen pot. Also *polle*=*sartago* (Mone 415, 23), *fyr-ðolle*=*clibanum* (Mone 415, 23), seems to belong here. Nay, I am inclined to think that *al-ðahrt* (*alðahrt*) might read *al-ðahl* (*alðahl*).

<sup>23</sup> =Lagana, *Ahd. Gl.*, i, 336, 56, =*similaginem*, i, 697, 31.

<sup>23b</sup> *hil-hama*=*cicada* WW. 131, 35=*hylleshama* 378, 7 belongs here, being a counterpart of modern 'cricket-on-the-hearth,' as indeed crickets are 'little animals found in Bakers' Ovens.'

meaning of the gloss plain to him, but somehow he seems to have failed. What he says is: '*te-tridit*, prs., *tramples*,' *Ef.* 344: *tedridtid* (*defecit*), cp. *desicit*. It is evident that we have to start from the reading of the *Erfurt Gloss.* (= *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, v. 356, 53) *defecit tedridtid*; the reading of the *Corpus Gl.*, *desicit*, is simply due to one of those common confusions of the letters *f* and *s*. Now, if we remember the phrase *tempus (me) deficit*, we shall not hesitate to say that *tedridtid*=*teðridtid* must stand for *teorið tid*, this *ð* looking so like an *o*,<sup>24</sup> is the same that 487, 16 tripped up Wülker and his docile scholar Hall. I hardly need mention that *tempus* corresponding to *tid*, has been inadvertently left out by the copyist. From WW. 136, 27, Hall enters a *tægung*, sf., 'tincture' = *deagung*, but is that not rather an error for *telgung*? (cf. 277, 35; 517, 20, where the word is correctly exhibited). Sweet is Hall's authority for telling us that by the side of *tæfl* (*tefel*, *tefil*) there is such an Old-English word as *tasol*, *tasul* for a 'die.' If he had inquired into the matter and remembered Wülker's note to WW. 526, 5, he would have seen that *tasol*, *tasul* is misreading for *tafol* and *taful* corresponding to OHG. *zabul*. That there is no such word as *sytlewæga* for 'weight, balance,' but that this is a blunder for *lytle wæga*='small scales,' Sievers had already pointed out, and from Hessels' edition of the *Corp. Glossary* he might have learned that Sweet's *gerinen*, etc., 'diligent' is Latin *germen* (*Corp. Gl.*, Int. 229=Sweet OET. cp. 24); and from the same source that Sweet's *here-searu* 'war-stratagem,' is Latin *hereseorum*=*αἰρέσεων* (Hessels' *Corp. Gl.*, Y. 6=WW. 54, 39). Nor is there any Anglo-Saxon *rægerose*, meaning 'spinal muscles.' The word is simply an invention of Sweet, made up from what he found in *Erf.* 3. 1181 (= *Glossæ Nominum*, ed. G. Löwe, p. 58., No. 977), *inguen lesca hregresi*. The Latin word shows plainly that the word must refer to the genital parts, and in fact we have to read *heg-presi*=OHG. *hegadrosi* (cf. *Ahd. Gl.*, ed.

<sup>24</sup> Accordingly we have *Corp. Gloss. Lat.*, v. 382, 50 *pauD pauua* in the *Erfurt Glossary*, while the *Epinal* correctly exhibits *pauo*; *Corp. Gl. Lat.*, v. 396, 20 the *Epinal* has incorrectly *testudo bor Ohaca*, while the *Erfurt* exhibits the more correct *bor Dthaca*.

Steinmeyer-Sievers, ii. 228, 49)=Mod. German *Hagedrüse*=*Leistendrüse*, 'inguinal gland,' *Leistengegend*, 'inguinal region,' *lesca*, which Sweet considered to be Latin,<sup>25</sup> is identical with the *leosca* 'groin' (Hall took from Kluge's *Etym. Wörterb. d. deutsch. Spr.*)=ME. *leske*=OSw. *ljuske*=Dan. *lyske* and is the ground-word of the verb *be-lisnian* (= *be-liscnian*), *be-listnian*, 'to emasculate, castrate,' which he took from WW. 106, 31; the word occurs also in the Anglo-Saxon Translation of the Gospels, Matt. 19, 12: *belistnode eunuchizati*. Just as imaginary as the above-quoted word for 'spinal muscles,' is the entry *neweseoða*, wm., 'pit of stomach.' The passages on which Sweet, OET., p. 619a, based his new coinage are *Epinal Gl.*, 505 (= *Corp. Gl. Lat.*, v. 365, 43) *ilium neuñ seada*=*Erf.* *nænsida*, *Erf.* 3. 1180: *ilium neisn nænsod* (= *Gloss. Nom.*, p. 52, No. 852). Comparing such glosses as WW. 26, 6: *ilia midhridir, nioðan weard hye*; 159, 36: *ilium scare*; 159, 37: *ilia smæle þearmas*; 427, 28: *ilium ryste*; 419, 9: *ilibus smæl þearmum*; 517, 14: *ilia innepas* with Hessels' *Corp. Gl.*, E. 439: *exta iesen*<sup>26</sup> (=WW. 20, 24, where Wülker wrongly exhibits *lesen*); WW. 521, 33: *exta iesendne*,

<sup>25</sup> Sure enough, there is a Greek-Latin word *ischion* (= *ἰσχίον*), the plural form of which *ischia*, written *iscia* (cf. *Corpus Glossariorum Lat.*, iii, 409, 61, *lumbi iscia*) might be hidden in ii, 333, 39 *ἰσχίον dossum lumba lesca* (= *t esca*, *t iscia*), but this conjecture seems superfluous in view of the fact that ME. has *leske*='groin,' and the Anglo-Saxon translation of the Gospels records a verb clearly pointing to a noun *tisca*. Perhaps we have to do with this *iscia* *ἰσχίον* in the puzzling gloss on record in the *Epinal-Erfurt Glossaries* (*Corp. Gl. Lat.*, v. 367, 27) *isca tyndirm-tyndrin*; as the gloss following is *ign(i)arium algiueorc-algiuerc*, it seems likely that *tyndirm* belongs as a synonym to *algiueorc* ('tinder, kindling wood') and has crowded out the proper interpretation of *isca*=*iscia*, namely *lesca*, which could the more easily drop out, as a very similar gloss preceded; namely *isic*=(*ἰσικ*) *leax-lex* 'salmon.' As to the form *tyndirm* on record here, Sweet OET., p. 570a, does not take any cognizance of it, but it is the same formation as *waestm* (= *waestma*) from *waest*, or *aecilma* from *aecil* (*egl*).

<sup>26</sup> Here belongs also, I believe, the *iesne* *ἰψνα*=*servus* of Prolog. Matth. North. Gosp. Matth., 19, 22: *ἔε esne*=*adolescens* (hence correct WW. 77, 40: *adolescens iunges* into *iunges*=*iung esn*), and *esneund condictorius* for example, *conductionarius*, WW. 212, 401. Hall did not understand it, and so bodily transferred it; it means, of course, 'a { man } belonging to (or dealing with) the class of (hired) servants' (cf. also *innheardmonn* 'miles,' Matth. 8, 9, Lindisf. Gosp.).



isend; 396, 22 *extis iesende oððe inelfe*; *Lorica Gloss.*, 71 (=Sweet, p. 172): *intestinis isernum*=*isennum* and *Ahd. Gloss.*, ii. 374. 37: *rien, testiculus niero*, I think, we shall be justified in supposing that *neisn* stand for *nē-isn*=*ner-isn*, that is to say, *nē* (= *nen* for *ner*) was copied from a manuscript where *n* and *r* were nearly alike in form, just as *næn-sood* stands for *nær-sood* and *nenū seada* for *neru-seada*; *sood* I consider to be a by-form of *sād* 'laqueus,<sup>27</sup> extale.' The meaning of *ilium ner-isn nær-sood, neru-seada* is then 'the reins.'

OTTO B. SCHLUTTER.

Hartford High School.

### NOCH—ITS ENGLISH EQUIVALENTS AND THE RELATIVE FREQUENCY OF THEIR OCCURRENCE.

In preparing a vocabulary of the most common words in simple German, I have had occasion to give some special attention to the particle *noch*. It occurs about 840 times in the following seven Readers: Brandt's, Bronson's (*German Prose and Poetry*, both parts), Buchheim's (both parts), Fasnacht's (first year), Harris', Joynes-Meissner's, and Whitney's (*Introductory*). Of these 840 cases, only about 50 belong to verse, the rest to prose. *Noch* as a temporal adverb occurs about 530 times; as an adverb of degree, measure, etc., 310 times. But it is often difficult to distinguish these two categories clearly. In the latter I have also included 24 cases of *noch* meaning 'nor,' which is in reality a different etymon.

I have put the 840 cases into four general groups and numbered the subdivisions consecutively from 1 to 37. Groups *A*, *B* and *C* contain the 530 cases of *noch* as an adverb of time; Group *D*, all others. Group *A* comprises about 300 cases of *noch* as referring to the present and to the past, the majority 179 uninfluenced by other adverbs; Group *B*, about 100 cases of *noch*+a negative, its most common modifier: and Group *C*, about 130 cases of *noch* as pointing forward to the future, relative or absolute. This classification is neither strictly logical, nor historical; it merely

aims at some practical results for purposes of translation.

#### GROUP A.

Whether *noch* in this group shall be rendered by 'still' or by 'yet,' may often be left to individual choice. In general, however, it seems safe to say that 'still' is more in harmony with present Eng. usage. [Consult on this point a *Shakespeare Concordance* and Schmidt's *Shakespeare Lexicon* and notice that 'still' was then often= 'constantly'; also: Young's *Bible Concordance*, where the use of 'yet' predominates and 'still' is registered only about half a dozen times.]

1. *Noch* with present and perfect tenses—96 times: (a) die Suppe ist noch etwas heiss, 'still'; (b) ich sehe sie noch alle deutlich vor mir, als wenn es erst heute geschehen wäre, 'still,' but cf. the use of 'yet' in *Cent. Dict.* s.v. *yet* i, 3; (c) "wollt ihr das?" "wie könnt ihr noch fragen?" (Brandt, 24. 14), 'is that still a question?' (d) wer es am meisten nötig hat, das wäre noch eine grosse Frage, lit. 'would still be a great question,' say: 'is at least very doubtful,' cf. *noch*= 'at least,' *D.* 37; (e) wissen Sie noch, was ich Ihnen neulich sagte? lit. 'do you still know . . . ?' say simply: 'do you remember what . . . ?'; (f) er hebt seine Stimme jetzt so hoch, wie er noch kann (Whitney, 171, 5), 'as his strength still allows,' or, 'enables him,' or 'as he possibly could'; (g) wenn ich auch alle Schätze der Welt habe, so habe ich doch noch allerlei Wünsche, 'I have, for all that, all sorts of wishes still'; (h) die paar Stunden, die noch übrig sind, 'which are still left,' or simply, 'which remain'; (i) aber meint ihr nicht, wir könnten noch entkommen? (Bronson i. 179. 3), 'still,' that is, now as well as a while ago, or, 'even now'; 'yet' would more likely refer to some time or other in the future (see *C.* 22), which is not meant by this emphatic *noch*; (k) noch ist es Zeit, dass ich gehe (cf. Brandt 168. 19), like (i) above, or say, 'it isn't too late yet for me to go,' and supply, 'but it will soon be too late'; (l) noch ist er verwundert über alles, was er hier sieht (Brandt, 122. 23), 'he is still surprised' . . . , or, in order to intimate more clearly that his wonder is expected to cease, say, 'as yet he is . . .,' cf.

<sup>27</sup> Cf. *Corp. Gl. Lat.* ii. 66, 47: *extalis* αργος=ὄργος that is, *testiculus*.